

REMARKS

The application has been amended and is believed to be in a condition for allowance.

Claims 1 and 3-17 remain pending in this application. Claims 18-32 were previously canceled.

The rejection under Section 112, second paragraph has been addressed by amending the claims to remedy the stated bases of rejection. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's kind attention and suggestions in this regard.

Withdrawal of the indefiniteness rejection is solicited.

Claims 1-4, 6-7, 9, and 11-17 stand rejected as anticipated by ANDERSSON et al. 2003/0198788.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-7, 9, 10 and 12-17 stand rejected as anticipated by MANSSON et al. 2004/0062916.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 12, 13, 15, and 17 stand rejected as obvious over RUPPEL et al. 5,339,730 in view of SCHULZ 6,361,601.

Claims 14 and 16 stand rejected as obvious over RUPPEL and SCHULZ '601 in further view of MURPHY 3,684,641.

Claims 1, 2, 7, 12, 13, 15, and 17 stand rejected as obvious over SCHULZ 4,376,671 in view of NYSTRAND 3,867,225.

Claim 3 is rejected over SCHULZ '671 and NYSTRAND in further view of YEO 5,503,076.

Claims 4, 5, 6, and 9-11 are rejected over SCHULZ '671 and NYSTRAND in further view of DOUBET FR 2824778.

Claim 8 is rejected over SCHULZ '671 and NYSTRAND in further view of McNEIL et al. 6,113,723.

Claims 14 and 16 are rejected over SCHULZ '671 and NYSTRAND in further view of MURPHY.

Claims 1, 2, 7, 12, 13 15, and 17 are rejected over SCHULZ '601 and NYSTRAND and SCHULZ '671.

Claim 3 is rejected over SCHULZ '601 and NYSTRAND and SCHULZ '671 in view of YEO.

Claims 4, 5, 6, and 9-11 are rejected over SCHULZ '601 and NYSTRAND and SCHULZ '671 in view of DOUBET.

Claim 8 is rejected over SCHULZ '601 and NYSTRAND and SCHULZ '671 in view of McNEIL.

Claims 14 and 16 are rejected over SCHULZ '601 and NYSTRAND and SCHULZ '671 in view of MURPHY.

Claim 1 has been amended and is believed both novel and non-obvious over the prior art and in particular over ANDERSSON and MANSSON.

Claim 1 was amended to include the limitations of claim 2, i.e., that printing of the first web shaped flexible

material takes place before lamination to the second web shaped flexible material and that the printing is to the inner side of the first web shaped flexible material facing the second web shaped flexible material. Claim 1 was also amended to specify that the printing step and the gluing step are distinct and carried out by different structures.

In its rejection of claim 2 over ANDERSSON, the Official Action notes Figure 1 and paragraphs 0015 and 0037. However, these disclosures are for the application of glue and optionally colored glue, not for a discrete printing step separate from the application of glue. Regarding printing, ANDERSSON specifies in paragraph 58: "a printing unit 33 may be arranged *after the second lamination station* for printing a pattern *onto one side of the laminated product 26.*" (emphasis added).

ANDERSSON does disclose a glue application step to the inside of a lamination ply before lamination. However, ANDERSSON does not disclose this printing as a discrete step as now required by amended claim 1. Because amended claim 1 requires printing and gluing in two separate steps, ANDERSSON cannot anticipate amended claim 1.

MANSSON, like ANDERSSON, does not disclose pre-lamination gluing and printing to the inside surface of a

lamination ply in two discrete steps with separate means. For this reason, MANSSON cannot anticipate claim 1 as currently amended.

Withdrawal of the anticipation rejections is solicited.

All other claims rejected over either MANSSON or ANDERSSON are believed not to be anticipated by these references because each depends directly or indirectly from claim 1.

Of the obviousness rejections, only three include claims 1 and 2.

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected as obvious over (1) RUPPEL et al. in view of SCHULZ '601, (2) over SCHULZ '671 in view of NYSTRAND, and (3) over SCHULZ '601 in view of NYSTRAND further in view of SCHULZ '671.


None of these combinations discloses gluing and printing on the inside of a lamination ply in two discrete steps using separate means for printing and glue application. To the extent these combinations do show a pre-lamination printing process to the inside surface of a lamination ply, the printing is actually the application of a colored glue and not a true, separate printing process with printing means separate from glue application means. For this reason, none of these reference combinations meets each limitation of currently amended claim 1.

Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 1, now including the limitations of claim 2 and an additional limitation that the printing step is separate from the glue application step, is allowable over the obviousness rejections that include claims 1 and 2.

Applicants respectfully submit that all other claims are also non-obvious as depending directly or indirectly from claim 1.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Roland E. Long, Jr., Reg. No. 41,949  
745 South 23<sup>rd</sup> Street  
Arlington, VA 22202  
Telephone (703) 521-2297  
Telefax (703) 685-0573

REL/lk